

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments**

#### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out what Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the invention as claimed provides edge enhancements to increase edge detail of the captured raw image as part of a demosaicing process. A captured raw image is defined as the image taken directly from CCD sensor and the image pixels are arranged in a Bayer pattern (see Applicant's specification, p. 2). No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

### **Rejections**

#### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

##### **Claims 1-15**

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hel-or in view of Kimmel (IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, Col. 8, No. 9). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 1-15.

Kimmel discloses reconstructing a digital image by first demosaicing and then enhancing the resulting image. The demosaicing step reconstructs the image using an edge-weighted interpolation, so as to avoid interpolating across edges and preserving edge detail. The enhancement step enhances the edges of the reconstructed image by inverting the color diffusion across the edge.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hel-or and Kimmel does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1-15. In independent claims 1, 6 and 11, Applicant claims providing edge enhancements to increase edge detail of the captured raw image as part of a demosaicing process. The

Examiner admits that Hel-or does not disclose enhancing edge detail as part of the demosaicing process and is relying on Kimmel as disclosing that element.

However, because Kimmel discloses providing edge enhancements to the reconstructed image after the demosaicing step, Kimmel cannot be properly interpreted as disclosing an increase to edge detail of the raw image as part of a demosaicing process. As neither Hel-or, nor Kimmel, teach or suggest this element as claimed in claims 1, 6 and 11, the combination cannot be interpreted as disclosing the claimed element. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1, 6 and 11 and claims 2-5, 7-10 and 11-14 that depend on them and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

### **Claims 16-20**

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hel-or in view of Kimmel and Lathrop et. al. US Patent No. 6,288,743. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hel-or, Kimmel and Lathrop do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 16-20. Claims 16-20 claim providing edge enhancements to increase edge detail of the captured raw image as part of a demosaicing process. Because Hel-or and Kimmel do not teach or suggest this limitation of claims 16-20, Lathrop must disclose at the least the missing element in order to have a proper *prima facie* case for claims 16-20.

However, because Lathrop applies edge enhancements to a full color image and not the raw image, Lathrop cannot be properly interpreted as disclosing providing edge enhancements to increase edge detail of the captured raw image as part of a demosaicing process. As none of Hel-or, Kimmel, or Lathrop teach or suggest this element as claimed in claims 16-20, the combination cannot be interpreted as disclosing the claimed element. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 16-20 and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

## **SUMMARY**

Claims 1-20 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

### **Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR  
& ZAFMAN LLP



Eric S. Replogle  
Registration No. 52,161

Dated: Nov. 22, 2004

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300